



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,958	10/24/2001	Jion-Iou Hong	3158/0J954	4878

7590 07/02/2003

DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
805 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ANYASO, UCHENDU O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,958

Applicant(s)

HONG, JION-IOU

Examiner

Uchendu O Anyaso

Art Unit

2675

M

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. **Claims 1-5** are pending in this action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant uses the term "SG cards" but nowhere in the disclosure, figures or claims does applicant define what "SG cards" means. Examiner shall interpret this term as a card that drives image or data or display or signals to a display panel.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Caine* (U.S. Patent 5,361,078).

Regarding independent **claim 1**, Caine teaches a display system capable of displaying images on a plurality of screens wherein each display cards 50, each driving four monitors

Art Unit: 2675

wherein the images are synchronously displayed on the display panels 60 by means of a master sync 45 and coprocessor with sync generator 34 (column 1, lines 5-13, figure 1, 2 at 34, 45).

Furthermore, Caine teaches a synchronization activator by teaching a coprocessor with sync generator 34 for generating a first signal (figure 3 at 34).

Furthermore, Caine teaches a pattern selector by teaching a keyboard 12 connected to a host 10 that is connected to a multiplexer 26 and enables the coprocessor to handle the manipulation of the image data (column 2, lines 65 through column 3, lines 1-6, figure 1 at 26).

Also, Caine teaches a controller in the form of coprocessor 34 that is connected to the display card 50 and simultaneously activates the display cards 50 the drives all the display monitors/panels 60 (figure 3 at 34, 50, 60).

Regarding **claims 2 and 3**, in further discussion of claim 1, Caine teaches a keyboard 12 connected to a host 10 that is connected to a multiplexer 26 and enables the coprocessor 34 to handle the manipulation of the image data (column 2, lines 65 through (*see Abstract; see also* column 3, lines 1-6, figure 1 at 26) wherein .

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2675

7. **Claims 4 and 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Caine* (U.S. Patent 5,361,078).

Regarding **claims 4 and 5**, in further discussion of claim 1, *Caine* does not teach explicitly power in the display system. However, it is would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art as to how power would be supplied to the display system and the display cards 50 in order to supply the energy that would make the display system operable.

The motivation for doing so would have been to supply the needed potential to the display system and display cards 50 that would enable the operation of the system.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 4,884,068 to *Matheny et al* for a multiple display system.

U.S. Patent 5,438,185 to *Narukawa* for an IC card apparatus for connecting reference potential terminal of a card connector.

U.S. Patent 5,510,809 to *Sakai et al* for a controller including multifunctions.

U.S. Patent 6,137,536 to *Yamaguchi* for a synchronizing signal generator.

U.S. Patent 5,122,869 to *Kinugasa et al* for a video signal processing apparatus.

U.S. Patent 4,259,744 to *Junod et al* for a signal generator.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uchendu O. Anyaso whose telephone number is (703) 306-5934.

Art Unit: 2675

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Uchendu O. Anyaso

06/27/2003



STEVEN SARAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600